DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 100 028 EA 006 649

AUTHOR	Trump, J. Lloyd; Karasik, Lois S.
TITLE	The First 55.
INSTITUTION	National Association of Secondary School Principals, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	67
NOTE	34p.
AVAILABLE FROM	National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1201 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 (Free)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC Not Available from EDRS. PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Education; Change Agents; Educational Administration; *Educational Change; Field Experience Programs; *Followup Studies; *Internship Programs; Leadership; Leadership Training; *Principals; Program Evaluation; Secondary Education; Surveys

ABSTRACT

This booklet summarizes the major findings of a comprehensive followup of the original interns in the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) Administrative Internship Project for Secondary School Improvement. In 1962, the NASSP sought support from the Fund for Advancement of Education for an administrative internship pilot project that was, in effect, a design for leadership. The project aimed to develop principals who would assume more vigorous instructional leadership of schools and become the agents of change. The proposed program also aimed to help innovative schools demonstrate and advance further improvements in secondary education. The project design was triangular, built around three main groups of participants--the interns who would become educational leaders, the schools where they would work, and the universities that would supervise the interns and work with the schools. (Author)

ED 100028

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
NASSP
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

THE FIRST 55

by

J. Lloyd Trump
Lois S. Karasik

EA 006 649

Presented by
The Administrative Internship in Secondary School Improvement

A Project of
The National Association of Secondary School Principals
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036

FREE

THE AUTHORS

J. Lloyd Trump is Director of the National Association of Secondary School Principals Administrative Internship Project. After 17 years as school teacher, principal, and superintendent in Indiana and Illinois, and 12 years as Professor of Education, University of Illinois, he joined the NASSP staff as Associate Secretary in 1960. He directed the organization's staff utilization studies, starting in 1956. These projects and his publications have emphasized more individual learning for pupils and higher professional functions for teachers. His Ph.D. is from the University of Chicago.

Mrs. Lois S. Karasik is a graduate of Vassar College and also holds a Master's Degree in Education from the Graduate Teachers College of Winnetka, Illinois. Formerly she was a junior high school teacher in the Winnetka, Illinois, schools. She has been associated with the NASSP Internship Project since it began in 1963.

Copyright 1967

National Association of Secondary School Principals
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D. C. 20036

CONTENTS

1 — The First 55	1
2 — Some Highlights	2
3 — The Project	5
4 — The Interns	7
5 — The Schools	11
6 — The Universities	15
7 — The Project Staff	19
8 — What Does It Mean?	20
The Participants	24

THE REPORT

This booklet summarizes the major findings of a comprehensive follow-up of the original interns in the NASSP Administrative Internship Project for Secondary School Improvement. This two-year pilot project was supported by the Fund for the Advancement of Education.

Members of a four-man survey team traveled across the country to visit each former intern in his present position. Terrance E. Hatch, Professor of Education, Utah State University and an Associate Director of the project, coordinated the field study. He was assisted by Sam F. McClanahan, a Graduate Assistant at the University of Missouri; Jean McGrew, Principal, East High School, Lincoln, Nebraska; and David A. Spencer, Assistant Principal for Instruction, Madison East High School, Madison, Wisconsin. These assistants are all NASSP interns.

The authors consolidated data from the field studies with other information available from reports made by interns, principals, and university supervisors.

THE FIRST 55

This is the story of 55 people—the first NASSP* Administrative Interns. They changed, and so did some schools and universities, because of their internships. Who the interns were, what they did, and what they became make up the content of this booklet.

Historically, most internships and apprenticeships in the professions and trades have aimed to preserve the status quo. They transmitted an established body of knowledge and skills from one generation to the next. In this sense, the NASSP's internship for future principals departs from tradition. Its goal is not conservation—but innovation. Its intent—not to preserve the established educational order, but to challenge it. Its method—to change priorities for school principals and some relationships between schools and universities.

Between 1963 and 1965 these interns, hereafter called the First 55, each spent a year in a selected junior or senior high school that was moving in new directions. Twenty-four universities across the country supervised these internships locally. Now in 1967 the interns are employed elsewhere. Members of our NASSP survey team recently made personal visits to all former 55 interns in their present jobs. They saw each of them at work. They asked questions of them and their present colleagues. The survey team learned about the effects of the internships on schools and universities. This follow-up study suggests procedures and raises questions for many schools and universities to consider.

*NASSP—*National Association of Secondary School Principals*

2 SOME HIGHLIGHTS

Before becoming NASSP interns, the First 55 were in most cases teachers in junior or senior high schools. A few were department heads or assistant principals. The personal qualities they held in common were promise and ambition. All had masters degrees, and most had done advanced work toward their doctorates. Their own classroom experiences had taught them that most schools could be better. Young enough to look ahead and see themselves as school principals, they had serious plans to be a part of the action to improve schools.

Today more than four fifths of this pilot group hold responsible positions in secondary school administration. Nineteen are principals and an equal number are assistant principals. Nine hold other administrative jobs, from supervisor to superintendent. The remaining eight are in full-time doctoral study, university teaching, or high school teaching.

Today they possess another professional common denominator. Almost without exception, they regard improving the instructional program as their most important task and encouraging innovations as the most promising means to that end. Giving the instructional program their top priority, three fifths of them now spend almost half of their time this way—far more than do most principals as reported in the recent nationwide NASSP surveys of the principalship.

Whether as the principal who designed a "drop-in center" for students to use freely after school hours or as director of the Upward Bound Project for a large city public school system, these former interns today focus on individual students and on the development of school programs that are right for them.

What did the internship offer these men and women that they might not have found elsewhere? According to the interns themselves, it was a unique combination of theory and opportunity to practice, based on the principle that one learns by doing. First was a strong commitment to the need for changing schools; second, on-the-job opportunity to work full time with teachers on better instruction for pupils in schools that are in session; and third, according to 85% of them, came an understanding of ways to cope with resistance to new programs.

Employers reached out to these people to bring new life and new skills to their schools. According to their current colleagues, the interns are doing just that. Actually, for 37 of the First 55, the internship was an important consideration in being hired for their present positions.

Although money is not the measure of the man, it is not unrelated to accomplishment in our society. Four years ago, the interns' median annual income was $7,000, ranging from $6,400 to $12,500. Today their median annual salary is $11,000—with a range of $7,000 to $18,250.

They are assuming leadership rapidly. Many admitted during the interviews that they already hold jobs that they never could have aspired to without the internship. One of them, still under thirty and already carrying high level responsibility for instruction, attributes his warm acceptance in the school district—despite his youth—to the experience gained in the internship. Perhaps it is not exaggerated to say that the internship is a vehicle for the man in a hurry.

What of the schools that were, in effect, the interns' laboratories? Forty-seven schools took part in the pilot program. They shared an interest in improving instruction under principals who provided able leadership. Eighty-five per cent of the interns found their schools to have a definite posture toward change. Innovative programs most frequently under way were team teaching, some form of individualized instruction, use of new media, and experimental kinds of pupil grouping and placement. Over two thirds

of the supervising principals say that changes took place in their schools because the interns were there. Two of them said it this way:

> "He established a nongraded English program and developed a tremendous esprit de corps among the English staff."
>
> "Because of him, teachers have a healthier attitude toward the introduction of new programs."

Twenty-four universities participated in this pilot program. Three fourths of them report that the project has influenced their graduate programs. They place more emphasis on the instructional leadership role of principals. Several ongoing internship programs have been revised along the NASSP Internship Project's lines to emphasize the importance of working with teachers to improve instruction. Eight universities are incorporating the internship into their preparation programs for principals.

The pilot project with its 55 interns left many questions unanswered. For example, is there genuine commitment to the idea that the principal's main task is to improve instruction? Are schools willing to pay the costs of an added staff person who is learning how to work with teachers to improve their teaching? Do universities know which schools provide the best settings for internships? Do university staff members really want to work closely with secondary schools to improve teaching and learning? Yes, we have much more to learn about the internship idea—and how to improve schools and universities.

These highlights are significant, but it is important to put the project in perspective. For the whole story, this report turns now to the beginning—how the project came to be and how it worked.

3 THE PROJECT

For more than half a century, the NASSP has demonstrated practical ways to educate a diverse school population. The tempo increased after World War II. The search for new methods gave rise to the Staff Utilization Studies, begun in 1956. During these studies, in schools across the country, one problem occurred again and again. Although money was available to experiment with different ways of teaching, there was a shortage of venturesome principals, willing to try out new ideas.

In 1962, the NASSP sought support from the Fund for the Advancement of Education for an administrative internship pilot project that was, in effect, a design for leadership. The project aimed to develop principals who would assume more vigorous instructional leadership of schools and become the agents of change. The proposed program also aimed to help innovative schools demonstrate and advance further improvements in secondary education. The Fund granted the NASSP a sum of $330,000 for a two-year pilot project, to begin in 1963.

The project design was triangular, built around three main groups of participants—the *interns* who would become educational leaders; the *schools* where they would work; and the *universities* that would supervise the interns and work with the schools. The project staff, in the NASSP's Washington headquarters, developed guidelines for each of the groups and then administered and coordinated the work of all participants.

The project structure included an informal check-and-balance system. Each intern was employed in a school under

the direct supervision of the school's principal. At stated intervals, the intern reported to his university supervisor whose main job was to see that the intern's activities stayed within the framework of project objectives. University supervisors also visited the schools and, on occasion, involved their university colleagues in work with the school staff. Working agreements spelled out the obligations of all participants and governed their relationships. All aspects of the project were subject to final review by the project staff.

Each school paid its intern a salary generally commensurate with that of teachers with similar preparation and experience. During the first pilot year, project funds paid about half the intern's salary and provided clerical expenses and travel. During the second year, new schools received $1500 toward the intern's salary. Project funds also covered the expenses of interns, principals, and university supervisors for orientation seminars, the interns' attendance at the NASSP Annual Convention, and routine project meetings. Each school district paid the balance of the intern's salary. Each university contributed the services of a supervising professor. The NASSP provided headquarters and the services of the project director.

The project started officially with an orientation seminar held at the University of Illinois in the summer of 1963. That fall fourteen interns, each in a different school, worked under the supervision of seven universities. The original participants were hand-picked. In the second year, however, the project was expanded so that by June 1965, 55 interns had worked in 47 junior and senior high schools, under the supervision of 24 universities. All but one university and one school district continued on for the second pilot year.

Currently, the project is continuing under a grant from the Ford Foundation which extended and expanded the original pilot project through 1968.

4 THE INTERNS

The typical intern was a 32-year-old married man with two children, who had been a classroom teacher for eight years. In fact, the group ranged in age from 24 to 49; six were single; there were two women; and about one fourth of the interns had some prior administrative experience. All had masters degrees or the equivalent, and most had done advanced work toward the doctorate.

The First 55 in the pilot project came from two sources. Twenty-nine were graduate students singled out by the universities. They interned in a variety of schools and followed diverse employment paths when the internships ended. The remaining 26 were nominated for internships by the school districts where they worked. They followed an "intramural" path, staying within their own school districts both for their internships and post-internship employment.

To illustrate the intramural pattern, one English teacher interned in a suburban high school where he worked on flexible scheduling and on the educational requirements for a new school plant. At the end of his internship, he was asked to remain not only in the district, but in the same school, in a position that grew directly out of his own work as an intern. On the recommendation of the principal, the board of education formalized the intern's role and named him assistant principal for instruction.

Each intern worked full time in a school directly under the principal and with the staff. Four fifths of the group carried the title of "administrative intern." The remainder were called either assistant principals, or curriculum coordinators. Whatever the title, the intern's main assignment was to work closely with teachers to upgrade the instructional program. Within the framework of individual school

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

settings, interns sought to:

Help teachers make better use of learning resources in the school.

Bring new curricular developments to the attention of the staff.

Help teachers develop plans for experimentation.

Work with teachers already engaged in experimental studies.

Learn about the relationships between educational facilities and the instructional program.

The intern's role was meant to be outside the line of authority in the school hierarchy. He was to operate as a "free agent" moving easily from team to team, grade level to grade level, department to department. This entry in an intern's daily log shows one way this happened:

> "I was approached by two English teachers whose classes I've been visiting . . . they told me they wanted to try a new approach . . . mentioned a few ideas and asked if I would help."

Another intern described himself in this way:

> "I was a person without line responsibility. I could devote my time to infusing new ideas into the school. I could read. I could write if I wanted to. I could leave school to visit, or I could think."

Without question, the free-wheeling nature of the internship assignment with its emphasis on change emerged as one of the most significant provisions in the project.

This conclusion does not imply that each internship was an unqualified success. There were problems, most of which related to excessive use of the intern's time for routine jobs. It was understood that interns would sample a variety of routine administrative jobs during the internship, but in no case were they supposed to carry continuing responsibilities for such things as bus schedules or the cafeteria.

Controls were built into the project structure to insure the emphasis on instruction. Interns kept daily logs to show how they spent their time. Not only did they record their activities but they analyzed and evaluated them against

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

the objectives of the internship. Supervising professors and the NASSP staff examined the logs and visited schools to make sure, for example, that interns did not show visitors around the school too many hours in the week. In spite of the checks and balances, 33 of the interns said that they carried more than occasional responsibility for discipline and other routine supervision of pupils.

Nevertheless, the emphasis on instruction prevailed. All 38 who are now either principals or assistant principals say that the internship helped get them ready for instructional leadership. Today the interns see a strong cause-and-effect relationship between what they did as interns and what they do now.

The interns express these relationships best in their own words:

> "It would be difficult if not impossible to find an activity or experience which did not in some way reflect the influence of my NASSP internship . . . whether it is a program to make better use of audio-visuals . . . developing a new schedule . . . or working with our math teachers on a new fifth-year program."

> "During my internship I had the opportunity to take part in opening a new school . . . and to observe the problems . . . and the principal's reactions to those problems . . . this was invaluable to me as I am now planning a new school of which I will be principal . . ."

> "My internship certainly influenced the way I operate as a principal . . . I spend more than the usual time with instruction . . . we initiated some successful pilot programs in team teaching, the use of learning resource centers, and continuous progress . . . that was the direct result of my internship . . ."

Even interns who are now assistant principals, working mainly with student discipline, view their present jobs differently. One explained it this way:

> "Much of my work with students who are having trouble is directed toward trying to give them a more satisfying instructional program. I would

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

never have approached the students this way before the internship."

Forty-seven of the 55 interns credit the internship with teaching them ways to cope with resistance to change.

Interns learned how to get teachers interested enough in some new ideas to try them out with students and share in the decisions of what to teach and how to teach. When the NASSP survey team visited former interns on their present jobs, these are examples of what they saw:

> This principal has developed a sizable team teaching program in a school that is old, in a neighborhood that is changing, with a staff that is 'old guard'. . .
>
> This intern, now an assistant superintendent, has done much with teams and organizing teachers for curriculum development. He is currently the thrust behind the design of a new high school which will have three wings—one for fine arts, one for applied arts, and one for humanities. Each wing will develop a team program.
>
> This intern is assistant principal in a large urban junior high . . . he is impressive . . . he is working especially with social studies teachers on the use of large and small groups in combination with the local ETV network . . . teachers we spoke to praised him and said he was doing all in his power to improve instruction in the school . . .
>
> One former intern, now a high school principal, has done away with his office to avoid the traps of in-boxes and out-boxes. Apparently this principal puts in a new system and then asks permission to do it . . . he hasn't been fired.

Today the First 55 speak the same instructional language. All those in secondary schools say that they modified existing programs in their schools the first year on the job, and continue to do so. Most have introduced new programs. Four have opened new schools as principals.

Eight of the 55 now have the doctorate degree. Another 23 have completed all requirements for the degree except the dissertation. All their names and current positions are listed at the end of this booklet.

5 THE SCHOOLS

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Forty-seven schools, located in 18 states, participated in the two-year pilot program. Forty-two were senior high schools; five were junior high schools. Most were larger schools in cities or in suburbia but one high school had only 350 students. Thirteen of the 14 school districts in the first year of the project continued the second year and 26 new districts were added. More important than these statistics, however, is what happened inside the schools. Are the schools different because the interns were there?

One intern in a large high school had special knowledge of programmed materials and audio-visual aids. In an empty classroom she set up an audio-visual resource and programming center for teachers and invited them to come by during free periods to learn more about preparing and using these aids. That room soon became a beehive of activity. When the intern's year ended, the room had become so indispensable to the staff that the principal set it aside for the following year and placed a qualified person in charge.

In another large high school, attendance in English classes for noncollege-bound students was down and discipline problems were up. The intern went to work with English teachers to cope with these so-called "terminal" cases. They turned the classroom into an "English lab" in which a selection of individualized materials was put out for student use. There were tapes and records; a reading wall with a display of magazines, newspapers, and paperback books; filmstrips that could be viewed individually, and self-checking exercises. The principal reports that this "English lab," established with the intern's help, is still in business and running strong.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A principal in another school describes his intern this way:

> "He made many people feel that they could attempt something different from the ordinary . . . he helped several groups of social studies and English teachers to experiment with team teaching . . . with poetry presentations for underprivileged children . . . with more effective use of overhead projectors and other visual aids . . . he promoted a recognition by many staff members of administrative interest in the teaching process and the readiness to offer resource assistance."

Another intern focused his work on redesigning programs for the educationally disadvantaged. With his help, the staff redesigned courses in language arts, social studies, mathematics, and science so successfully that, at the end of the internship, a teacher with special training was transferred to the school to continue and coordinate the project.

Mathematics teachers in one school took advantage of the intern's presence to work out a new course for non-college-bound students. It combined practical trigonometry, statistics, and some modern math concepts. Students who previously had shied away from mathematics signed up for the new course in large numbers. According to the principal, they still register a full teacher's program for it every year.

Space does not permit illustrative descriptions for each of the First 55. The exact content of each internship varied widely from school to school. It was conditioned by the size of the school, the existing program, the intern's own strengths and experience, and the principal's commitment to instruction. Each intern has a story that is his own . . . some less impressive than those included here.

The important fact is that two thirds of the principals say that the interns made a difference in their schools.

Two ingredients are vital in any school to provide a proper setting for the NASSP-type internship. First, the principal of an intern-school cares deeply about improving instruction so that teachers are encouraged to try out new

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ideas, knowing they can count on his support. Second, the intern becomes a working member of the school staff and not just an observer. At the beginning of the year, the principal's job was to introduce the intern to the staff, define his role clearly, and to give him substantial visibility. He assigned immediate responsibilities that brought the intern into the mainstream of school life.

When there was close rapport between intern and principal, the principal acted as the intern's counselor, judge, and critic. One intern tells of singing a duet with his principal at a faculty party entitled, "Anything You Can Do I Can Do Better." Some interns were not that lucky. Ten of the First 55 were somewhat uncomplimentary regarding the supervision provided by their principals.

The interaction between interns and teachers was a two-way street. The "free-wheeling" nature of the intern's assignment, combined with the premium placed on change, often worked to soften and resolve staff resistance to new programs. Like the intern, the teachers learned by doing. Many learned that a new idea which works can be very exciting indeed; one that does not work out is more of a challenge than a cause for dismay.

Usually the participating universities selected the schools. The settings ranged from the conventional to the most educationally innovative in the country. Two interns illustrate divergent experiences in schools:

> "My experience was excellent primarily because of the nature of the school I was in. We seemed to fit. It was very nondirective. I could initiate my own activities. I got to see some high-powered people at work. I couldn't honestly say whether the internship was a factor in my being selected for the position I now have or whether it was because I was associated with that school and its principal."

> "My internship was a frustrating and disappointing experience. The school was not change-oriented, and my assignment was not in line with the guidelines for the project. Nevertheless, it was

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

> of real value to me to become part of the program. I was exposed to ideas through the NASSP seminars and the convention and the literature sent to me. I was continually stimulated to work for curriculum improvement."

These were two interns—in two different schools. In September 1966, both became principals. Although both express strong commitment to change, the second will have to learn more on the job because he did not have the opportunities as an intern to put his ideas into practice.

During the follow-up study, all participants were asked individually to estimate the value of the intern's contributions to his intern-school as: Much—Some—Little. Approximately three fourths of the principals and three fourths of the professors said, "Much." The interns were modest—only one fourth of them replied, "Much," while more than half said, "Some."

One principal summarized his thinking in these words:

> "I feel the whole intern program enlightened our school. It made us aware of the values of leadership in administration . . . since the project we have a direct intern program with the university in our system . . . the NASSP project has moved us to a fresh and imaginative concept of administration . . ."

After the first two pilot years about half of the schools stayed with the project, despite considerably reduced financial support for individual schools when the project was extended and expanded. Most schools that dropped out did so because of lack of funds. This leads directly to one of the basic questions raised by the study—how to get school districts or states to assume financial responsibility for administrative internship programs.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

8 THE UNIVERSITIES

Twenty-four major universities took part in the NASSP pilot project. Their roles had three dimensions. First, they helped to identify and select candidates and schools. Second, they supervised the interns to see that they worked primarily with teachers on improving instruction. The third, and most complex, university assignment was to make their own resources and staff available to the schools by way of the interns. An overriding purpose of the project was to demonstrate how a good internship could bridge the gulf that exists between many schools and their local universities.

Interestingly, the most significant effect of university participation has not been the universities' influence on the schools, which had been anticipated, but the project's influence on the universities. Three fourths of the pilot universities report that the project has affected their own graduate programs, the most common influence being increased emphasis on instruction in course work for school administrators.

Five universities that had no previous internship programs now require internships if students have previously had none. Three universities that had offered a general administrative internship, on a part-time basis, are changing to the NASSP-type, full-time internship, with emphasis on instruction. Seven other universities now recommend the NASSP-type internship in their graduate programs for the principalship. One fourth of the universities report that current movements in their states to require internships for the administrative certificate were stimulated by the NASSP project. This, in turn, has acted to institutionalize internships in these university programs.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

One professor describes what happened this way:

> "Our university now has an internship program being developed in local schools and the State Department of Education which is patterned after the NASSP program . . . we will have as many as eight internships for the coming year . . ."

Another professor reports:

> "The NASSP project has definitely increased our interest in internship programs . . . it has given our young men an opportunity to have a rich experience and fill a gap in their professional training . . ."

During the pilot program, about half the interns selected were identified by the universities, and half by the schools. Generally, the procedures for identifying and selecting interns and schools turned out to be thornier than had been anticipated. The original intention was for universities to seek out promising graduate students and place them in advanced local secondary schools. Sometimes universities found it difficult to identify the better schools, or to obtain the cooperation of those they preferred. Occasionally, the universities and schools did not see eye-to-eye on the caliber of a candidate. Despite the lack of rigid selection practices, the selection of interns and schools worked out satisfactorily in most situations.

The joint selection of interns and schools by universities and school systems results in the best internships.

Although university supervision was important at all times, it was especially valuable when a principal did not make proper use of an intern's time and talents. University professors met with interns, both in schools and on campus, to review the interns' logs, to analyze what they did, and to redirect their activities when necessary. When the evidence showed that interns were too heavily involved in school routine, university supervisors were responsible for correcting the situation. Apparently they supervised the interns with varying degrees of success.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

One third of the interns say they received much help from the university; another third said they had some university help; and a third of the interns felt they had little or no help from the university.

A university's contribution to the internship could be substantial. This excerpt is from an intern's log:

> ". . . through the internship we obtained two consultants for an English in-service meeting at school . . . one professor from the university spoke on reading problems and how to detect them at the secondary level . . . the second, a trade school teacher from a neighboring city, gave an outline of his individual approach to English, developed especially for the terminal student . . . teacher reaction was very favorable . . . because many teachers had been raising questions that the speakers helped to answer."

Only a few of the interns found this kind of help for their schools in the universities. The fault is divided. Principals and teachers in many schools failed to tell the universities exactly what kinds of help they needed. In some universities, professors were willing to supervise the interns but did not reach out to the schools.

One continuing question for universities concerns the point at which the internship best fits into a graduate training program. The First 55 agree that anyone considering an internship should have a masters degree, or the equivalent, and at least three years of experience working in schools. Eight of the NASSP interns now have their doctors degrees, and twenty-three others have completed all work toward the doctorate except their dissertations.

In the pilot program, about one third of the interns received no university credit for the internship; about one third earned six hours' credit; and another third received anywhere from 3 to 18 credits. If the internship idea is to survive and flourish, it will have to be institutionalized in university programs, as well as in schools.

A key finding of the study is that universities need to give credit for the internship in order to build it into their

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

graduate programs as part of the supervising professor's teaching load.

The NASSP project has scratched only the surface of what can be accomplished when schools and universities join forces. It fires the imagination to think what might happen if this university's report were the rule rather than the exception:

> "In our clinics and seminars we use _____ High School as an example of a school that is awake, alert, and changing . . . we had inquiries from at least a dozen schools about placement of administrative interns next year . . . and have already placed five . . . our administrative training program has new life . . ."

In communities where universities and schools discovered each other through the internship, the project demonstrated that the total strength of the three-way design for an intern-school-university coordinate is far greater than the sum of its parts.

7 THE PROJECT STAFF

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The NASSP project staff established policies and procedures for the internships, and supervised the program. Staff members did this in orientation seminars, in school visits, through correspondence, in publications, and in follow-up evaluations. They had the guidance of an able Advisory Committee. The project staff and the Advisory Committee are listed on page 28.

Staff members also encouraged instructional innovations by providing background materials and information to interns and schools. The annual NASSP Convention highlighted the internships and presented provocative programs for secondary school administrators. The project staff responded to requests for information about new practices with an assortment of printed and duplicated papers.

Special project publications include:

Design for Leadership—a booklet describing how the pilot internships worked.

Focus on the Individual—A Leadership Responsibility—a 25-minute color filmstrip about newer instructional practices. Also a booklet, same title, 33 pp.

The Present Is Prologue—a 40-minute color film on the principal's role in instructional leadership. Also a booklet, same title, 35 pp.

The NASSP Internship Newsletter—a semi-annual leaflet that describes internship activities.

All these publications were circulated widely throughout the country, and to some degree in other countries.

What the project staff did has to be done by another agency if internships for principals take hold widely and excel. In all probability this need constitutes a state responsibility.

WHAT DOES IT MEAN?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Pilot projects are undertaken to test ideas. The central assumption of the NASSP Administrative Internship Project is that schools will be substantially better if procedures for identifying and preparing secondary school principals are improved in a vital way. To test this premise, the pilot project aimed to select outstanding interns, to place them in stimulating schools, and to enlist interested university faculty to supervise the interns and work with the schools.

This follow-up study of the First 55 produced some findings that emerge quite clearly. Also, in the course of the study, certain questions were raised, but not answered—questions too important to be overlooked. We present here some findings—and some questions.

SOME FINDINGS

➤ **The three-way design of the NASSP internship is essential.** There may be internships without universities to provide in-service training for a school district; and there may be university internships that use schools solely as laboratories with no real commitment from the school district—but neither single effort has so great a potential for an excellent internship program as the combination of both.

The most productive internships occurred where the selection of interns and schools was done jointly by universities and school districts. Joint selection allows a broadened point of view that neither institution achieves alone.

Internships are enriched when the intern is enrolled with credit in the graduate program at the university, and not just appended to a higher institution. This arrange-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ment strengthens the university's commitment to the project. Because the intern is better acquainted at the university, he knows which resources are available, both material and human, and feels freer to call on them in behalf of the school.

▶ **The First 55 regard improving instruction as their top priority job. As practitioners, they now spend almost half their time on instructional activities.**

▶ **Interns, like students, learn by doing.** The NASSP interns were in schools full time. According to the project arrangements, they were to carry continuing assignments and responsibilities to work with teachers. No matter how outstanding the school, if the intern remains an observer, on the outside looking in, the internship will not work well. This happened only in a few cases.

▶ **The free-wheeling role of the intern, combined with the emphasis on change, gives this internship special strength.** In most cases, interns were relatively free of extended administrative duties. They had the time, the place, and an experienced principal's guidance in their work to help teachers adopt and advance new programs. Two thirds of them helped to produce important differences in the schools where they interned.

▶ **The essential characteristic of a principal who supervises interns effectively is that he cares deeply about improving instruction.** He also recognizes that an intern needs experience with those instructional programs that are moving the school ahead, and directs the intern accordingly.

▶ **The intern-school itself need not be a model of the newest educational practice so long as some teachers show reasonable interest and willingness to change and try out innovative programs.**

SOME QUESTIONS

▶ **What is the best road to the principalship?** Is it necessarily the position of assistant principal? There are different

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

kinds of assistant principals—some work mainly with discipline, attendance, and managerial tasks. What is the relation of an internship to these assistant principalships? Does one take the place of another or are both necessary?

➤ **At what point in a principal's preparation should an internship be taken?** The First 55 agree that no one should become an intern without at least three years' teaching experience in schools. They believe that interns need to have completed their masters degrees, or the equivalent, but very few think it necessary to be far along toward the doctorate. They also agree that an intern should be able to qualify for an administrative certificate in the state where he hopes to work after completing an internship.

➤ **Despite the importance placed on evaluating new programs by the NASSP project staff, why did all participants—interns, schools, and universities—largely ignore or avoid this fundamental aspect of change?** Although the project provided evaluation resources, they were rarely used. Why does evaluation continue to be such a problem for teachers and school administrators?

➤ **What is needed for schools and school districts to assume more responsibility for internships?** Most systems are reluctant to train people that may move elsewhere even though the evidence shows that interns make positive contributions during their internships.

➤ **Is it possible that the indirect effects of this kind of internship are as significant as the direct findings?** Many participants report that although they cannot pinpoint particular changes, they feel that their actions, thinking, and commitments all have been affected by the NASSP project.

➤ **Where will smaller schools find qualified leadership?** Only a few of the pilot-project interns currently work in smaller schools. Small schools need instructional leadership, too.

➤ **How can internships be adapted to large urban school systems?** Critics say that internships may disrupt the established pattern of job progression within a large city school

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

system. But the creative approach to instructional problems encouraged by the internship was valuable in several large cities.

➤ **How can experienced principals keep up to date?** There are thousands of working principals with years of school leadership ahead of them whose preparation is already largely outdated. Would some variation of the NASSP-type internship work for practicing administrators?

➤ **What is the long-range role of the NASSP in stimulating and promoting internships in the preparation of principals?** Although the NASSP does not run schools or universities, it has a large stake in the professional programs for preparing secondary school principals.

➤ **What really keeps so many neighboring universities and schools apart, when there is so much they can do for each other?** Do universities give recognition in rank and pay to professors who prefer to work with schools? Do schools encourage teachers to look to the university for answers to their instructional problems?

* * *

Both the findings and the questions are provocative. The potentialities for the profession are intriguing. This year Seattle, Washington, became the first major city to expand and semi-institutionalize an NASSP-type internship. On the move in many ways, Seattle has budgeted for and installed some ten NASSP-type interns in its schools, under the supervision of a 1965-66 NASSP intern. This city views its new internship program as a vital source of future leadership.

Long-range follow-up studies are planned for the First 55, and for their successors. The real ending of the story, however, will be written elsewhere—in schools, universities, and by you—the reader of this report.

THE PARTICIPANTS

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE INTERNS AND THEIR PRESENT POSITIONS

Ames, Robert G., Superintendent of Schools, Germantown, Wisconsin

Bennion, John W., Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum, Instruction, and Research, Elgin Public Schools, Elgin, Illinois

Boeve, John, Assistant Director of Personnel, Livonia Public Schools, 15125 Farmington Road, Livonia, Michigan

Branciforte, John F., Assistant Principal, Lynbrook High School, Lynbrook, New York

*Burroughs, Donald A., Principal, Miami Jackson High School, 1751 N.W. 36th Street, Miami, Florida 33142

Byrd, William A., Jr., Principal, Miami Killian High School, Miami, Florida

*Caton, Jay, Coordinator of Secondary Instruction, Jefferson County R-1 School District, 1580 Yarrow Street, Lakewood, Colorado 80215

Clickenger, Howard V., Assistant Principal, Terrill Junior High School, Terrill Road, Scotch Plains, New Jersey

Crittenden, John F., Consultant, South Florida Desegregation Consulting Center, 9900 S.W. 161st Street, Miami, Florida

Crowley, Leon V., Assistant Principal, Jefferson Junior High School, 6800 South Blackwelder, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

Dale, E. Larry, Doctoral Student, Washington State University, 1601 Clifford, Pullman, Washington

Davis, Billy R., Principal, Johnson Junior High School, 7415 Tropicana, West Melbourne, Florida

Eyster, Ira M., Assistant Professor of Education, Westmar College, LeMars, Iowa

Fleishman, Ernest B., Assistant to the Associate Superintendent for Secondary Schools, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

*Geiken, Lloyd A., Principal, Shorewood Junior-Senior High School, 1701 East Capitol Drive, Shorewood, Wisconsin 53211

Gorton, Richard A., Principal, James Madison Memorial High School, Gammon Road and Mineral Point Road, Madison, Wisconsin

Gourley, Lewis J., Principal, Clair E. Gale Junior High School, 955 Garfield, Idaho Falls, Idaho

Gregorc, Anthony F., Assistant Principal for Instruction, North High School, 34041 Stevens Boulevard, Eastlake, Ohio 44094

Gross, Ruth K. (Mrs.), Assistant Principal, Parkland Junior High School, Rockville, Maryland

Hansen, Donald, Assistant Principal, Alameda Junior High School, Jefferson County School District, Lakewood, Colorado

*Jenkins, John M., Principal, Miami Springs Senior High School, 751 Dove Avenue, Miami Springs, Florida 33166

*Joly, Roxee W., Principal, The Julia Richman High School, 317 East 67th Street, New York, New York 10021

(*) *Denotes 1963-64 Interns*

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Kampschroer, Roger A., Principal, Dubuque Senior High School, 1800 Clarke Drive, Dubuque, Iowa 52001

*Keller, Arnold J., Assistant Principal, North Plainfield High School, Wilson Avenue, North Plainfield, New Jersey

Kellerman, George, Assistant Principal, Wantagh High School, Wantagh, New York

Kelley, Edwin, Principal, Stewart Elementary School, 4525 North Kenmore Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60640

Keys, Donald, Boys Vice Principal, Brookhurst Junior High School, 601 North Brookhurst Street, Anaheim, California

Larson, Robert L., Doctoral Student, Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts

Maher, William J., Assistant to the Principal, Wilbur Wright Junior High School, 8400 West Burleigh Street, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53222

McGrew, Jean, Principal, East High School, Lincoln, Nebraska

Morris, J. Clair, Principal, Cedar City High School, 703 West 600 South, Cedar City, Utah

*Nelson, Aaron N., Principal, Santa Cruz High School, Santa Cruz, California

Plouffe, Albert, Assistant Principal, Norwich Senior High School, Norwich, New York

Polatnick, Samuel, Principal, Springfield Gardens High School, 143-10 Springfield Boulevard, Springfield Gardens, New York 11413

*Preising, Paul P., Assistant Principal, Wilbur Junior High School, 480 East Meadow Drive, Palo Alto, California

Reese, William M., Assistant Principal, Roy High School, 2150 West 4800 South, Roy, Utah 84067

*Roberts, Frank E., Principal, Mitchell Elementary School, 1335 East 32nd Avenue, Denver, Colorado 80205

*Robinson, John S., Chairman, History Department, Brookline High School, Brookline, Massachusetts; Associate in Education, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts

*Roth, Richard L., Principal, Rhinelander Union High School, Rhinelander, Wisconsin 54501

Scherrer, J. Frederick, Vice-Principal (Curriculum and Instruction), Taylor Allderdice High School, 2409 Shady Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15217

*Sheridan, Philip H., Assistant Principal, Julius West Junior High School, 651 Falls Road, Rockville, Maryland

Shovlin, Hubert J., Administrative Vice Principal, U. S. Grant High School, 2245 North East 36th Avenue, Portland, Oregon 97212

Shutes, Robert E., Assistant Principal for Curriculum and Instruction, Palo Alto Senior High School, 50 Embarcadero Road, Palo Alto, California

*Simcox, Ronald W., Assistant Superintendent in Charge of Curriculum and Instruction, De Kalb Community Unit Schools, De Kalb, Illinois 60115

Simon, Bernard, Principal, South Broward High School, 1901 North Federal Highway, Hollywood, Florida

(*) Denotes 1963-64 Interns

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Smith, Arthur Clark, Assistant Principal (Curriculum and Administration), Miami Northwestern Senior High School, Miami, Florida

Snyder, Harry A., Jr., Teacher, Allegheny High School, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Sommers, Norman L., Principal, Central Junior High School, Tallmadge City Schools, Tallmadge, Ohio

Spencer, David A., Assistant Principal for Instruction, East High School, Madison, Wisconsin

Townley, John L., Deputy Superintendent, Division of Instructional Services, Palo Verde Unified School District, 187 N. 7th Avenue, Blythe, California

Turner, Arthur H., Administrative Assistant for Instruction, Champaign Unit Four Schools, 703 South New Street, Champaign, Illinois

Ubben, Gerald C., Assistant Professor, Department of Educational Administration, College of Education, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee 37916

*Vlasak, Richard F., Principal, Ole A. Thorp Elementary School, 6024 West Warwick Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60634

Williams, Richard C., Assistant Professor, School of Education, University of California, Los Angeles, California

Yates, Kenneth R., Secondary Supervisor (Holmes County), Bonifay, Florida

(*) *Denotes 1963-64 Interns*

THE PRINCIPALS AND THE INTERNSHIP SCHOOLS

Amar, Benedict, Nicholas Senn High School, Chicago, Illinois

Arns, LaVerne C., North St. Paul Senior High School, North St. Paul, Minnesota

Bethers, Pratt M., Cedar City High School, Cedar City, Utah

Brown, B. Frank, Melbourne High School, Melbourne, Florida*

Bruno, Gordon, Middletown Senior High School, Middletown, New York

Cavanagh, Francis J., North High School, Framingham, Massachusetts

Constans, Phil, Cocoa Beach High School, Cocoa Beach, Florida

Dezort, Francis J., Scotch Plains-Fanwood Junior High School, Scotch Plains, New Jersey

Dombrow, Oscar, James Monroe High School, New York, New York

DuBois, Lee, Julius L. West Junior High School, Rockville, Maryland

Emma, Paschal J., John F. Kennedy High School, Silver Spring, Maryland

Friedrichs, Don, Bentley High School, Livonia, Michigan

Gallant, Thomas, Huron High School, Huron, Ohio

Griffin, Jack, Nathan Hale High School, Tulsa, Oklahoma

Hawthorne, Walter H., Lynbrook High School, Lynbrook, New York

Healy, Harold E., Ridgefield High School, Ridgefield, Connecticut*

Heaston, Vernon, Lakewood High School, Lakewood, Colorado

Howard, Eugene R., Ridgewood High School, Norridge, Illinois*

King, Bettina, Meadowbrook Junior High School, Newton Centre, Massachusetts*

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Korey, Harold, Kelly High School, Chicago, Illinois
Lackey, Rodney P., Orange High School, Cleveland, Ohio
Longenecker, Richard G., Senior High Annex, Champaign, Illinois
Ludeman, Leroy, Washington Park High School, Racine, Wisconsin
MacDonald, John G., Mission San Jose High School, Fremont, California
Malo, Roy O., Jefferson High School, Portland, Oregon
Malone, J. Frank, Northwest Classen High School, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma
Manion, Glenn, Idaho Falls High School, Idaho Falls, Idaho
Manning, M. Nephi, Weber County High School, Ogden, Utah
Michael, Lloyd S., Evanston Township High School, Evanston, Illinois*
Mills, Harold, William Horlick High School, Racine, Wisconsin
Monahan, Patrick, Wisconsin Heights High School, Mazomanie, Wisconsin
Moore, Steve, Miami Beach Senior High School, Miami Beach, Florida
Nelson, Sidney, Escambia High School, Pensacola, Florida
Ohanian, Arthur, Arvada West High School, Arvada, Colorado
Pease, Everett G., Hialeah Senior High School, Hialeah, Florida*
Rifugiato, Francis J., Perry High School, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
Ruppel, Ray P., Palo Alto High School, Palo Alto, California*
Schuker, Louis A., Jamaica High School, Jamaica, New York
Singer, Harry B., Westinghouse High School, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
Smith, David, Valley Forge High School, Parma Heights, Ohio
Steldt, Milton F., Wilbur Wright Junior High School, Milwaukee, Wisconsin
Swenson, Gardner, Brookhurst Junior High School, Anaheim, California*
Talbert, Ray, Bend Senior High School, Bend, Oregon
Torgelson, John, Kellogg Senior High School, Roseville, Minnesota
Wilson, Webster D., Troy High School, Fullerton, California
Wise, Vance L., Manual High School, Denver, Colorado
Wolfe, Arthur, Nova Senior High School, Fort Lauderdale, Florida

(*) *Both years of Pilot Project*

THE UNIVERSITIES AND THEIR REPRESENTATIVES WHO SUPERVISED THE INTERNS

Anderson, J. Paul, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland
Anderson, Lester W., University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan
Austin, David B., Columbia University, New York City, New York
Baker, G. Derwood, New York University, New York City, New York
Boyan, Norman J., Stanford University, Stanford, California
Burrup, Percy E., Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah
Dolce, Carl J., Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts
Gorman, Burton W., Kent State University, Kent, Ohio
Hatch, Terrance E., Utah State University, Logan, Utah
Hearn, Arthur, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon
Kimbrough, Ralph B., University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida
Knezevich, S. J., Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

LaFranchi, Edward H., University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California
Laughlin, Hugh, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio
McCleary, Lloyd E., University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois
Maidment, Robert, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois
Marshall, Stuart A., Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts
Nickerson, Neal C., Jr., University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota
North, Stewart D., University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin
Romine, Stephen A., University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado
Samuelson, Everett V., University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho
Snider, Glenn R., University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma
Wey, Herbert, University of Miami, Coral Gables, Florida
Wynn, Richard, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

THE PROJECT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Lloyd S. Michael, Principal, Evanston Township High School, Evanston, Illinois, Chairman
John R. Beery, Dean, School of Education, University of Miami, Coral Gables, Florida
Robert L. Foose, Principal, Westfield Senior High School, Westfield, New Jersey
Bettina King, Principal, Meadowbrook Junior High School, Newton Centre, Massachusetts*
Evelyn Konigsberg, Associate Professor of Speech and Education, Adelphi University, Garden City, Long Island, New York
James M. Peebles, Principal, Wellesley Junior High School, Wellesley, Massachusetts
Stephen A. Romine, Dean, School of Education, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado
Ray P. Ruppel, Principal, Palo Alto High School, Palo Alto, California
Ellsworth Tompkins, Executive Secretary, NAASP, ex officio
J. Lloyd Trump, Secretary
(*) Committee member until 1965

THE PROJECT STAFF

J. Lloyd Trump, Director, Associate Secretary, NASSP
J. Paul Anderson, Associate Director, Associate Professor, University of Maryland
David W. Beggs, Associate Director, Assistant Professor, Indiana University*
William Georgiades, Associate Director, Associate Professor, University of Southern California*
Terrance E. Hatch, Associate Director, Professor, Utah State University*
Paul B. Diederich, Evaluation Consultant, Research Division, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey
Lois S. Karasik, Editorial Associate, Washington, D. C.
(*) Added since 1965

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

WHERE WE ARE NOW

Because the pilot project described in this booklet seemed so promising, the Ford Foundation granted the NASSP $750,000 to extend and expand the project for three additional years, through 1968. The number of interns, schools, and universities are approximately double those of the second pilot year, and the staff is also larger. Data now being collected may help to answer some of the questions raised by the pilot project.